IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

R.S.A.No.585 of 2003

DATE OF DECISION: APRIL 3, 2007

Jaspal Singh

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

Amrik Singh and another

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Vijay Lath, Advocate,
for the appellant.
Mr.Pritam Saini, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

...

This is plaintiff's Regular Second Appeal challenging the judgment and decree passed by both the courts below whereby his suit for permanent injunction, has been dismissed.

In this case, the appellant is the grandson of Balwant Singh whereas defendants No.1 and 2 are the sons of Balwant Singh. The appellant claimed exclusive possession of 24 Kanals of land owned by Balwant Singh on the basis of an annual Chakota. Both the courts below have recorded a finding of fact to the effect that the plaintiff-appellant has failed to prove the said Chakota, therefore, he was not found in exclusive possession of the suit land. By recording the said finding of fact, the suit was dismissed.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, I do not find any ground to interfere in the said finding of fact.

No substantial question of law is involved in this appeal.

Dismissed.

April 3, 2007 (SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
vkg JUDGE